









For the Lowry & DeGustai

LETTERS OF A LAYMAN.

REMARKS BY A LAYMAN—

NO. IX.

THE pro-catholic layman, whose fervent enthusiasm during the last five months has been giving life to many a false notoriety which is belatedly being exposed, has been so busy with the squabs which kind nature has marked out for them, his soul has been so overwhelmed with the thought of his kindred, that he has been the butt of conventional jest not so far removed from the lot which an all-wise Father in heaven has assigned them. Horace tells us that such was the case with the poet himself, and the "layman" has shown that, however great the enlightenment of the nineteenth

[illegible][illegible]

and study had rendered him capable of advancing any cause. In this controversy I have shown, in the most palpable manner, the Episcopalianism, from a theistic and scientific point of view, to be a system of unbelief. It is a timid, hesitating system of religion, which no logical or penetrating mind can accept. It owes its existence to the wholly false and unchristian assumption that the law of its marriage with the English government can be called a church, since it is only a moral agent subservient to the desecrated, unscriptural, unchristian, and unrighteous Great Britain. The Dean of Bristol says: "The Church of England boreited by the law, upheld by the law, paid by the law, and made change by the law, just as any other in-

[illegible]

"When I proved to the 'layman' that he was 'One Lord, one faith, and one baptism,' I meant One Lord, no faith, and one baptism."

[illegible]

dogma of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and then proceeded to prove, by the strongest and plainest arguments from the writings of our fathers, the primitive church, that they had believed and taught the same doctrine. Nothing can be stronger or more convincing than the language used by these writers; hence, it is not surprising that the late Lord Shaftesbury admitted that the fathers, with regard to this dogma, hold the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The esteemed "layman" knew no more of the fathers than he did of the Scriptures, to which the good, easy man, was new as to the latest disputes by the Atlantic Cable. He thought, at first, that it might be sensible to affirm that the fathers did *not* mean what

But upon reflection he found that this was not a poor shift, even for a man of his own limited mental capacity. Nothing remained to be done but to make the most of the material, which is the sum and substance of his last childish and pitiable offense. He, however, brings no specific charge against me, except with regard to my inability to understand the words of St. Jerome in his commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew (chaps. 26, v. 2), in that the passage which I quoted from his commentary was not there. He is mistaken. It thus does not exist. His ignorance of Latin and the fact that he had not the original text before his eyes, may in some measure account for the unpardonable error.

own, ran excuse him from guilt in making the second assertion. For, not being able to read St. Jerome in the language in which he wrote, he was obliged to have recourse to an English translation of the works of the Father. Now, although he is unable to write English, he is surely able to read it, and to understand the plan and the meaning of the article. I have the works of St. Jerome in the language in which he wrote, and am prepared to prove the correctness of my quotations.

It is not, however, the case with the texts of Scripture into which he inserted the word *Petrus* is not to be found in the three texts of Scripture into which he inserted it. He says, however, that the article was hastily written, and that he had no opportunity of examining it. Fortunately, he has no

even his own dear ignorance, can excuse him in this matter. If any word, which in itself at least resembles the language used in Scripture, has been taken advantage of to suggest some measure have excused the "layman" from shameless and guilty perversion of Scripture, then such is not the case, and consequently the crime admitted is not pardonable. The "layman" is susceptible, in the case of the "Immaculate" is susceptible of the following diagnosis:

He has proved nothing except his own knowledge and the manifest absurdity of his cause which he has tried to defend.

He himself stands before the public as a liar, a perjurer, a perverter of Scripture and a misleader of the people. He has been exposed by the columns of the "Democrat."

There are professional money lenders everywhere who take the greatest possible advantage of unscrupulous people. The Earl of Jersey recently brought suit against one of them, named Bicker, which has produced some interesting developments. Bicker had obtained a college loan on the allegiance of \$2,500 a year. He could not get about that, so he borrowed of Mr. Dickier the sum of \$250, for which he gave an endowment of \$250 a month. Mr. Dickier charged an interest at the rate of only 600 per cent. When once a young man goes to a money lender it is understood to be all over with him. In three years Mr. Dickier had made \$37,500 out of the Earl of Jersey.

debt to them to the amount of \$248,000. I paid that sum, and now a further demand is made upon me for \$177,000. Lord Jersey did not direct to him, but he received more than \$200,000 of Messrs. Dock and Yarns according to which the account stands thus: Money received, \$60,000; money claimed, \$22,000; money—holding, \$10,000; money—paying, \$10,000; money—borrowing, and profit of \$150,000 in six years, from one customer, is not bad.

present very much in vogue in the French capital, and which is known as the game of "Questions and answers." Each member of the company writes on a slip of paper a question, and the slips are promiscuously distributed among the players, who secretly write an answer at the foot of the question; the course, witless, sarcasm, or wit of the answer, is the object of the game. One of the players had propounded the delicate question, "What is the secret of the happiness of married life," to which the following answer was given: "It is the secret of the happiness of married life, which is never offered at the table."

**A MODEL FARM.**—The Hareburgs, IPA, St. Grand says: "The model farm in Chester County, as we have already stated, will be ready for operations as soon as the weather permits." The president, and in a letter recently published, he says the farm is already stocked and equipped; the programme of experiments for the current year laid out, and with the opportunity for exchange with other farms, a great light is thrown on this experimental farm is well understood. Many of the unsettled questions in practical agriculture will be the

the comparative value of manures, and the proper mode of applying them to the most profitable crops, the sheep and swine; the latest improved implements, &c. Maugham has ever been very anxious to believe this experimental turn of mind, to be the most profitable and interesting, and important to the practical farmers throughout the State, and for this reason it has strong claims upon their cordial and active co-operation.

Our contemporaries in all parts of the country continue to publish cheering reports of the condition of the growing crops, and an abundant harvest is anticipated.



